Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, and Yulee-33.

Bradbury, Dickinson, Dodge of lowa, Douglas, free States, voting in the negative, Mr. Atchison moved to smend the bill by striking out the first four sections-relating to Cali-

Mr. Foote advocated the motion.

Mr. Phelps moved that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Bradbury said that he believed the bill was now in the shape in which it could be passed, and he hoped the Senate would not adjourn till

Mr. Phelps advocated his motion, and was replied to by Mr. Atchison.

Messrs. Foote and Hale continued the debate.

The question was then taken on the motion o Mr. Phelps, by yeas and nays, and resulted as YEAS-Messrs Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton

Butler, Chase, Clarke, Clemens, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Ewing, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Phelps, Seward, Smith, Soulé, Spruance, Turney, Upham, Wales, Winthrop, and Vulce-28.

Navs-Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Ber-

rien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foote, Houston, Jones, King, Mangum, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Shields, Sturgeon, Underwood, Walker, and

So the Senate refused to postpone the bill to dennitely. The question recurring on the motion of Mr.

Atchison to strike from the bill the four first sections, relating to California, it was decided in the negative, us follows: YEAS-Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Benton, Berrien, Butler, Clarke, Clemens, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dodge of Iowa, Downs, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King,

Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Phelps, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Smith, Soulé, Turney, and Yu-NAYS - Messrs. Baldwin, Bell, Bradbury, Bright, Case, Chase, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge, of Wisconsin, Ewing, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Norris, Seward, Shields, Spruance, Stur-geon, Underwood, Upham, Wales, Walker, Win-throp, and Whitcomb—29.

Mr. Douglas moved to amend the 5th section

of the bill by making the southern boundary of Utah the 38th parallel of latitude.

Mr. Sebastian moved to amend this, by insert ing 36° 30' instead of 38°; and the amendment to the amendment was rejected-yeas 23, nays 27. Mr. Douglas modified his amendment so as to make the boundary the 37th parallel, but withdrew it to allow Mr. Winthrop to move a reconsideration of the vote on Mr. Atchison's proposi-

Mr. Winthrop withdrew his motion to allow Mr. Berrien of Georgia to move to strike out the second section of the bill, which is as fellows:

"That until the Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned, according to an actual enumeration of the inhabitants of the United States. the State of California shall be entitled to two Representatives in Congress."

And the question being taken thereon, the mo-

tion to strike out was rejected by the following Vote: YEAS-Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell,

Berrien, Butler, Clemens. Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Downs, Foote, Hunter, King, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Turney, and Yulee-21. Navs-Mesers. Baldwin, Bell, Benton, Brad-

bury, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Ewing, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Houston, Jones, Miller, Norris, Phelps, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Upham, Wales, Walker, Winthrop, and Whitcomb—37. Mr. Winthrop said that he was opposed to all

combination of distinct and incongruous measures; he was in favor of a fair, open, and distinct vote on each and every measure. He desired to have such a vote now, and therefore made the motion to reconsider the vote by which Mr. At-chison's motion was rejected. First taken on the motion to strike out all re-

lating to New Mexico and Texas, and decided in the affirmative, as follows: Ygas-Messrs. Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton,

chusetts. Davis of Mississippi Davton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Douglas, Ewing, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Morton, Pearce, Phelps, Scward, Shields, Smith, Sould, Turney,

NAYS-Messrs. Atchison Badger, Bright, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Downs, Foote, Houston, Jones, King, Mangum, Norris, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Spruance, Sturgeon, and Whitcomb-22.

Mesers. Bright, Cass, Dickinson, Dodge Iowa, Jones, Norris, Spruance, Sturgeon, and Whitcomb, voting in the negative, appeared to have no repugnance to Dawson's amendment and Texas aggression.

Mr. Douglas offered a substitute for the proviso. It was to the effect that the Territorial Government provided for by this act for New Mexico shall not go into operation either on the east or west side of the Rio Grande before the first of June next; provided that the commissioners shall submit their report to Congress by the first of February next; and in the mean tim the rights of Texas and the United States shall remain unprejudiced.

Mr. Hale moved the indefinite postponement of Mr. Badger called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and the question being taken, the

motion was rejected : Butler, Chase, Clarke, Clemens, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Ewing, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Hunter, Mason, Miller, Phelps, Seward, Smith, Soulé Turney, Upham, Walker, Winthrop, and Yu-

NAYS-Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Day son, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs Felch, Foote, Houston, Jones, King, Mangum, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales

The vote on Mr. Winthrop's motion to re consider was as follows: YEAS-Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Baldwin, Barn

well, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Butler, Clarke, Da vis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Daw-son, Dodge of Wisconsin, Downs, Ewing, Foote Greene, Hamlin, Hunter, King, Mangun, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Phelps, Pratt, Seward, Smith, Soulé, Turney, Upham, Winthrop, and NAVS-Messrs. Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Chase,

Clay, Clemens, Cooper, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Felch, Hale, Houston, Jones, Miller, Norris, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Walker, and Whitcomb-26.

So the vote was reconsidered. Mr. Pratt moved that the Senate adjourn. Lost Clemens moved that the bill be postponed till the first Monday in December next.

After some remarks by Messrs. Foote and Clemens, the question was taken, and the motion

Mr. Clemens then moved that the Senate adjourn, and, upon a division, the motion was re-jected. The question again recurring on the motion of

YEAS-Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Baldwin. Barnwell, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Butler, Clarke, Clemens, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Downs, Ewing, Foote, Greene, aggressions of Texas. King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Seward, Smith,

Nays-Messrs. Bradbury, Bright, Cass, Chase Clay, Cooper, Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge of Wis-consin, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Felch, Hale, Hamlin, Houston, Jones, Miller, Norris, Shields, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Walker,

Turney, Upham, Winthrop, and Yu-

The bill now contained nothing but the seventeen sections respecting a Territorial Govern-

Mr. Douglas moved then to make the southern boundary of Utah the 37th parallel. Mr. Dawson spoke in favor of an adjournment

He did not yet despair of a successful effort to do something for the country.

Mr. Benton said an idea had struck him. He thought that Homer had made a mistake in down as history the story of a chaste dame, who every night unravelled what she had wover in the day. He thought that Homer must have had a vision of the action of the American Senhad a vision of the action of the American Senate on this compromise bill. The omnibus was broken down, and the vehicle was gone, and there was but a single plank left. He was a kindly disposed man, and as some of the friends of this bill might have received an impression that he was otherwise, he would manifest his kindness. He was ready to vote for the last plank of the complexe and thereby do some homoge to the last omnibus, and thereby do some homage to the la

bors of the committee.

Mr. Dawson replied, and then moved that the

After some remarks between Messrs. Atchison,
Davis of Mississippi, and Foote—
Mr. Davis of Mississippi moved to amend the
amendment, by striking out "370" and insert-

Mr. Foote supported the amendment, and

Mr. Hale opposed it. Mr. Douglas accepted the amendment as a modification of his own. The question on the amendment being taken by yeas and nays, it was decided in the negative.

As as inlows:
YEAS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell,
Bell, Berrien, Butler, Clemens, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Douglas, Downs, Foote, Houston, Hunter, King, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Turney, Underrood, and Yulee-26. NAVS-Messra. Baldwin, Bradbury, Bright,

Chase, Clarke, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts-Dayton, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Ew, ing, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Miller, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Up-ham, Wales, Walker, Whitcomb, and Win-

Mr. Douglas then renewed his amendment proposing the line of 370 Mr. Mason moved to strike out 370, and insert

The amendment of Mr. Douglas was then The design of moving the line 360 30', was to

vision proposed he the Nacheille Concest prised that Mr. Douglas possipted the amendment, or voted for it. That Daniel S. Dickin-

son should do so, was to be expected. Messrs. Cass and Sturgeon sat in their seats when their names were called, and answered not a word.

The question being stated to be on ordering the bill to be engrossed for a third reading—
Mr. Ewing moved that the Senate adjourn

Mr. Soulé moved to amend the bill by adding thereto, that the said Territorial Legislature shall have no power to interfere with the establishment or abolition of slavery in the said Ter-

ritory.

Mr. Hunter moved that the Senate adjourn Lost—yeas 22, nays 25.

Mr. Rusk moved that the bill be laid on the table; and the motion was rejected-yeas 20

Mr. Soulé then withdrew his amendment. The question being again stated to be on or-dering the bill to be engrossed for a third reading, it was taken by yeas and nays, and resulted as

navs 29.

Jones, King, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pratt, Sebastian, Shields, Soulé, Spruance, Sturgeon Turney, Underwood, Wales, and Yulee—32 Navs—Messrs. Baldwin, Bell, Chase, Clarke Davis of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge of Wis-consin, Ewing, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Pearce, Seward, Smith, Upham, Walker, and And the bill was ordered to be engrossed for

third reading.

And then, on motion, the Senate adjourned.

## THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, AUGUST 8, 1850.

## " DRAWING IT MILD."

The New York Tribans undertook to convict u lately of a want of fidelity and candor, because we did not fully expose the conduct of the Northern Doughfaces in voting against the admission of Hugh N. Smith, Delegate from New Mexico. How much he made out of the charge, our readers who saw our last week's paper, can determine. But, let us see a specimen of the stern impartiality of our captious accuser.

Dawson's amendment is thus properly characterized by the editor: "It seems to me scarcely creditable, at a dis-

Ygas—Messrs. Baldwin, Barnwell, Benton,
Berrien, Butler, Chase, Clarke, Davis of Massashould be seriously entertained, much less ensix hundred miles long by an average of one hundred broad, contains at least sixty thousand civilized people, is threatened with invasion and civilized people, is increased and con-subjugation by Texas, is surrounded and con-stantly harassed by savage enemies, and utterly isolated from all sympathy or assistance. We are under solemn treaty stipulations with Mexico to extend to her people the blessings of civil government as speedily as possible. Yet here is a proposition not merely to refuse a Government to the New Mexican people, but absolutely to deprive them of that which they have, under the pressure of an imminent danger, estab-lished for themselves. And yet this monstrous proposition was crowded through the Senate by ne majority—yeas 29, nays 28."

Well-who concocted this "monstrous propo sition?" A caucus of the special friends of the bill; and was not Mr. Cooper of Pennsylvania one of them? Beyond all doubt. And who sanctioned mise: and the result was that Massachusetts, repand supported it ? HENRY CLAY, the idol of the resenting the anti-slavery States, at last consented New York Tribune. What has the editor to say of this conduct of his master? Not a word. And what of Senators Cooper and Phelps ? Hear

"Among the yeas were Mr. Cooper of Pennsylvania who voted under misapprehension of the question, and Gen. Shields of Illinois, who was goaded into changing his vote from nay to yea in opposition to his own deliberate judgment. Judge Pheles of Vermont also voted for it—for what reason I cannot imagine, I should as soon thought of a Vermont Senator voting to establish Slavery among the Green Mountains. But the mischief was done, and I can only hope that it won't stay done."

Who "draws it mild" now? "Mr. Cooper voted under misapprehension of the question." We don't believe it. Mr. Cooper must have knowa all about this odious amendment-its bearings, its design, its alleged necessity. It was a matter of previous consultation-and if he was under a misapprehension, he stood alone in the Senate Chamber. We don't believe it, Mr Tribune. "Judge Phelps also voted for it-for what reason I cannot imagine." Is it possible? And then Mr. Clay-Ah, friend, forbear-touch

not that sacred name! But, while the Tribune editor is dumb as to Mr. Clay's sins, and tries to smooth over those of Sentors Cooper and Phelps, towards Mr. Benton, who from the time he took his position on the Territorial and California Questions, a position known to be favorable to Freedom, has not moved one hair's breadth, defying opposition at home, and the denunciation of the whole South, he is implacable. Read the following, and then say, in view of the loud professions of the editor of the Tribune of devotion to the cause of Freedom, what kind of moral sense that man must have, who can denounce Thomas H. Benton for he was sustained by every Senator of the North Mr. Atchison, to strike out that part of the bill relating to California, it was agreed to, as slou, and glorify Henry Clay, for his described of Slavery from territory under the jurisdiction of the Edward Correction of that position, and in the face of the fact too that | Compromise by which a slave State was admitted he sustained a "monstrous proposition" for stripping New Mexico of all protection against the

"Now he (Mr. Benton) and Mr. Clay have met again, both Senators from moderate slave States, bo h friends of California and anxious for her admission; each opposed to the extension of slavery, and each originally in favor of admitting California by herself. But Mr. Clay became convinced that she would not surely be carried in as a part of a general system of organization and Government for the Territories, and he waived

The question being taken, it was decided in the thought it a wrong principle to compel Senators its extension involved any moral wrong, corruptand Representatives to vote for measures they believed inexpedient or wrong, for the sake of From that day to this, when we find him reappearsaving others which they believed to be right and important. He thought it wrong to sacrifice 70,000 square miles of New Mexican Territory. For these and other reasons, he resisted the appointment of a Compromise Committee, he re-sisted the bill reported by it, and all that he predicted of the delay and embarrassment consequent upon the attempt to push such a measure, has come to pass. The bill is defeated-for the simple reason, that a majority could not be found to vote for it-and the Senate to-day is just where it was four months ago.

The People, we think, will pronounce the conduct of Mr. Benton, " not Faction, but Statesmanship," and permit H.G. "to be a blockhead all his days," if he so please.

### COMPROMISE - THE COURSE OF MR. CLAY.

The policy of Compromise is not necessarily wrong or hurtful. Individuals at times advanconstantly adjusting their difficulties in the give some kind of countenance to the line of di- States closed a dangerous conflict of claims re- shigh moral sense cannot but disapprove. And how

> mere as more and the same state of boundary | compre in These between their possessions. The agreement (as volved no moral principle, for none was at stake are often obliged to resort to compromise, with a view to the settlement of domestic controversies. The antagonisms of class or section interests may sometimes be fit subjects for mutual concession, each class or section yielding something for the sake of a system of legislation that shall in the main be beneficial to all.

But there are limits to this policy, which must be determined sometimes by large views of expediency, sometimes by considerations of conscience-A very common vice among statesmen is, to regard all conflicts of claims, all issues between interests, as questions of expediency-devoid of any moral element, and therefore admitting of compromise. It so happens that in the course of human legislation, questions from time to time are springing up, for the just settlement of which YEAS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Benton, Berrien, Bradbury, Bright, Butler, Cass, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of Affirmatively or negatively, involves the perpendicular, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Houston, Hunter, tration or avoidance of a moral wrong, we subtration or avoidance of a moral wrong, we submit to every man of conscience, that it is one admitting of no compromise. No man in such a case can serve two masters. He must either do right or de wrong-there is no midway line, where he ceases to be an accountable being, and his acts are neither good nor evil. If he owe a duty, no considerations of expediency can justify his failure to discharge it, or his attempt to discharge half of it. Nor has he any right to enter into a covenant binding himself to do wrong to a certain extent, if the other party will do right to a certain extent.

Questions of financial or commercial policy and disputes about boundaries do not necessarily involve moral right or wrong, and therefore may be compromised: but, questions respecting Human Rights, the continuance or extension of Slavery, where we have jurisdiction over the subject. are primarily moral questions, and nothing is more certain than that no mode of settling them ought to be adopted, which is not in perfect harmony with Moral Principle. However exacting its demands, whatever difficulties oppose them, however formidable the interests with which they conflict, Reason and Religion enjoin prompt, unhesitating, entire conformity to them. An opposite course is practical atheism, implying a denial of the existence of a God, or of his right and power to prescribe law for the government of his Federal Convention in relation to the suppression of the foreign Slave Trade, was eminently a moral question. Many of the States regarded it as a crime against God and man, and felt that should it be allowed to continue under the flag of the Union they were forming, they would be involved in the guilt of supporting it. South Carolina and Georgia had no conscience about it, and insisted that it should be let alone. Beyond all doubt, this was no question for compromise. If the slave trade were criminal, the States believing so, made themselves criminal, by consenting to its protection by the Union, for a year, a day, an hour. But, this moral question together with one of mere policy was sent to a Committee with a view to secure arrangement by comproto sacrifice her conscience for a pecuniary consideration; to allow an immoral traffic under the protection of the flag of the Union, for twenty years, on condition that South Carolina and Georgia would permit a Navigation law to be passed by a bare majority of Congress. It is easy to say that necessity demanded this compromise-that the Union could not have been formed without it; but, the question arises, are there any considerations of policy, however urgent, that can justify an immorality? If so, then Right and Wrong resolve themselves into Expediency and Inexpediency-the terms Moral and Immoral are synonymous with Politic and Impolitic-the distinctions between Vice and Virtue

are to be determined by a calculation of loss and profit-Conscience is a mockery, and God a nonentity! No-the Slave Trade was criminal, and the Compromise which secured it protection by the flag of the Union twenty years, was immoraland the fruit of that Compromise has been death. Men do not gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. Agreements wrong in themselves become the prolific source of wrong doing. The Compromise between Massachusetts and South Carolina fastened upon this country the body of death under which it now groans. Had the Moral Sentiment of a majority of the States not been compromitted, had it stamped itself upon the Constitution, and procured the immediate prohition of the Slave traffic, the probability is that the system of slave labor would never have acquired sufficient vitality to subject to its baleful domination the new Territories subsequently

added to the Union. The Missouri Compromise, as it is called, was of the same kind. The Moral Sentiment of the North resisted the admission of Missouri as a slaveholding State, and demanded the exclusion and Slavery allowed in all the territory south of 360 30'. Northern representatives violated the convictions of their constituencies, and gave their sanction to the continuance, under the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government, of what they knew to be wrong. And what are the consequences? We see them in the vast growth of the Slave System, the infinite arrogance of the Slave Power, its enormous demands, and the perils with which it menaces the Union. It was easier to confront the power

ing as the champion of another Compromise, no less regardless of moral principle, he has maintained the same position and sentiments. He would now rather that free territory should remain exempt from Slavery, but if the attempt to erect safeguards around its freedom give birth to what he calls dangerous excitement, he sees no harm in desisting from it; and should Slavery in consequence extend its limits, he might regret it, that in all questions connected with it he acts but not repent the misconduct that led to such a from considerations of mere expediency, not from result. Is such a man fit leader for those who believe that Slavery is wrong; that its extension is wrong, that allowing or conniving at its extension is wrong, that it is the high duty of the Federal Government to interpose every constitutional impediment to its extension?

We would not do Mr. Clay injustice, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that his system of politics is for the most part a system of expedients-that he is in the habit of overlooking the moral elements of great political questions-that tageously settle their disputes, without resort to in his philosophy, the end, which we admit is genlitigation, by mutual concessions. States are erally a laudable one, justifies the means, and that when once embarked to carry through an importsame way. Great Britain and the United ant measure, he is apt to resort to devices which could it he otherwise? Surely the man who at-

'agricultic parties to vote in support of a measure conflicting with the principles of each, to settle in the claim of either party. Governments questions of right and wrong by considerations of a temporary expediency, must, at times, pursue a very devious and doubtful line of policy.

Let us review the course of Mr. Clay on the Slavery Question, since the introduction of his resolutions on the subject nearly seven months ago. It has been marked from that time by extraordinary changes, by constant variations of his position to suit circumstances, by a nice manipulation of the opposing parties, to determine their accessible points; by graduating, modifying, or altering his measures, with a view to secure a majority, with very little regard to abstract truth

or right. His resolutions affirmed the expediency of establishing Territorial Governments, without the Wilmot Proviso. This was a concession to the South; but as the North could not be expected, he said, to give up its cherished policy, without some equivalent, they further affirmed that Slavery did not exist in the Territories, either in law or fact. This was his preliminary movement for testing the disposition of the two opposing parties The South protested loudly against the equivalent; the North was silett. When acres At first he stood with Mr. Benton in urging the admission of California by itself, but seeing that unless this measure were associated with several others, the chances of compromise were barren, he deserted Mr. Benton, changed his position, became the leading opponent of the policy of admitting California by itself, and took an active part in raising the Compromise Committee, to which his resolutions were referred. This was his first change-a complete change of position.

What followed? The Committee labored-he drew up the report-he reported the bill or bills. Did they conform to his resolutions? Only in part. He had tested the temper of the two parties, and now ventured, in his report and omnibus bill, as it is called, to omit the equivalent yielded to the North by his resolutions in consideration of the abandonment of the Wilmot Proviso. The bill proposed to form Territorial Governments, without the Proviso, but not a word was incorporated in affirmation of the truth in law and truth in fact-that Slavery does not exist in the Territories!

This was change second-a change to please the South, and which, he inferred from the previous silence of the North, would not be very

Southern men denounced the blll, and demanded alterations to secure more effectually the interests of Slavery. Northern men said little The chief opposition came from the former. Mr Clay, having no conscientious scruples on the subject, no fixed moral principles, but regarding the controversy as one to be settled by a calculation of how most certainly a majority could be procured for the bill, looked leniently on the demands of the South.

The 10th section, as originally reported, prohibited the Legislatures from passing any law respecting African Slavery." This was offensive to certain Southern men, because in their opinion it prohibited the Legislature from enacting laws to protect the rights of propery in slaves. They proposed to substitute for the words "respecting African Slavery," the words "prohibitng or establishing Slavery"-so as to leave the Legislative power at liberty to pass police regulations respecting Slavery, should it find its way

Had Mr. Clay been a man of principle on this subject, instead of a man of expedients, he would have resisted the change, especially when the flagitious object of it was so boldly avowed. But it was necessary to conciliate support, and he consented to the alteration.

This was change third. The debate went on-the struggle grew more complicated—the prospects more confused. The provision relative to the settlement of the Texas coundary occasioned the greatest perplexity. The amount of money to be paid her for the relinquishment of her claims, was the rock on which the Compromise might split. The Texan Senators, it was understood, would take nothing less than ten millions: one or two friends of the Compromise could not tolerate this. Between them the bill was in imminent danger. Fill the blank with ten millions, and the one million men would bolt-fill it with one million or five, and Texas would bolt. A caucus was held; it was agreed that the entire provision concerning the settlement of the Texan boundary should be changed-and Mr. Bradbury, acting, we presume, as its exponent, brought forward in the Senate an amendment proposing Commissioners to determine the true boundary line between Texas and New Mexico, or sgree upon some compromise line, to be then submitted to Congress and the Texas Legis-

Here was change fourth-and a very essential one. It was, in fact, a complete obliteration of one of the main features of the bill-not dictated by any principle, but simply by a calculation of

by any principle, but simply by a calculation of chances, and an anxiety to secure the passage of some sort of a measure which could be styled a compromise.

Texas, however, boggled at this. Her Senators insisted upon certain amendments, designed to give her the vantage ground in the controversy, pending the proceedings of the Board of Commissioners; but they were voted down. The result was, disaffection on their part; and it became necessary to regain their support by some new conficients on the passage of the bill, unless certain modifications could be obtained thereto. Among these modifications was this one, and this was the most material. Another was the running of the boundary line between Texas and New Mexico, at the line of the 34th parallel of latitude, the objection to which was afterwards cessary to regain their support by some new concession, as inoffensive in terms to Northern men as compromising ingenuity could make it. At last a device was hit upon, and Mr. Dawson of Georgia assumed its paternity. He moved to amend Mr. Bradbury's amendment, by a proviso restricting the operation of the Government probis own choice to try that which seemed the more professing course. Col. Benton, on the other hand, professing to concur in an ill send in season and professing to concur in an ill send that seemed the more particular measure embodied in the Omnibus-admitting California, organising New Mexico and Utah without the Provise, settling the dissipated boundary, and buying off the claim of Texas.—has yet fought the measure with desperate energy from first to last, and now rejoices in its defeat, because it proposed to de altogether four things which separated the keartily appeared. If this is not faction, but statesmanship, let me be a block head all my days. But no—it is, it must be splem and childish nonsense. Old Bullion is evidently not long for this latitude. The people of Missouri will not spare him so far from home a year longer?

Mr. Beaton thought it a wrong principle to make the admission of California, a right measure in itself, depend upon the amount of money that might be voted to Texas. He vided for New Mexico, to the territory west of

Mexico out of the bill, exposed it to the aggressions of Texas, at the same time securing to the latter the benefit of an implied title!

This was change fifth; and did Mr. Clay entertain the moral view of Slavery prevalent in the North, we should define it as a profligate

From this general view of the conduct of Mr. Clay, from the time he introduced his resolutions, we are compelled to infer that the subject of Slavery is not with him a matter of conscienceany high moral principle—that the leading idea with him, in his attempt to settle the controversies growing out of it, was, not to establish right principles, not to do justice, not to secure the interests of Freedom, but simply to suppress agitation, and restore peace, by a Compromise framed without the slightest regard to the conscientious convictions of either of the antagonist parties, and to be consummated by any and every sort of appeal to their best or worst feelings, just as the exigency might demand. We do not question Mr. Clay's patriotism. He

loves his whole country; he is controlled by no narrow prejudices; he is devoted to the Union. and seeks its perpetuation. His intellectual power is great, his tact is extraordinary, his eloquence remarkably impressive; and he is en-

lect not inferior to his own. But the principle of Compromise has vitiated his character as a statesman, and given a direction to his political course, by no means conducive to the highest interests of his country. In every conflict between important principles we find him appearing, not with a view to determine which is the true principle, and then to enforce it in action, but as a Compromiser, insisting upon the sacrifice of both the opposing principles, without regard to their truth or falsehood, and upon the adoption of some expedient for securing a temporary peace between their respective advocates. The result has always been. not a settlement of any important question, but an evasion, a postponement-a mere hollow truce between hostile parties, while their antagonisms have gone on increasing, and the difficulties in the way of a permanent settlement have continually accumulated. It seems to us that it was the high duty of American statesmen to meet boldly every great question as it arose, to measure it in all its length and breadth, to ascertain the true principle on which it ought to be settled, and then to enforce that principle to its full extent. The conflict between opposing parties, instead of being evaded postponed, or allayed by temporary expedients, ought to have been decided one way or the other-in favor of one principle or another. Compromise, by balancing between opposing claims, by keeping up a sort of equilibrium between warring principles and interests, necessarily fostered agitation, irritation, mutual jealousies, insidious attempts at overreaching, thus intensifying the causes of hostility, which from time to time would necessarily provoke open and dangerous collision. Had Mr. Clay, as a statesman belonged to the school of Principle, instead of Expediency, had he proceeded on the theory that political questions should be disposed of according to fixed principles, not temporary devices, had he recognised in all his course as a legislator, the paramount claims of abstract Truth and Right, and conformed his conduct rigidly to them, he would have been the model statesman of the age, and his memory would have been consecrated by the goodness as well as greatness of his acts.

## THE LATE COMPROMISE BILL.

Mr. Clay charges upon Mr. Pearce the respo sibility of defeating the Compromise bill. The cause of its defeat was the exacting spirit of slavery. Bad as the bill was, abandoning as it did Senators, and certain members from the South-The former demanded an amendment which should withdraw protection from New Mexico, lay it open to aggression, and give Texas an implied title. The latter required the mutilation of California-its division by the line of 360 30' or 350 30'. The demand of the former was met by Dawson's amendment, in utter disregard of the opinion of Mr. Pearce, who, as a friend of the bill, on being asked his views, protested most earnestly against it. Determined not to yield such a point to the demands of Texas, he made his motion to strike out the amendment, which was carried; and then the Texas Senators voted against the bill! Now, how happens it that Mr. Pearce is to be denounced by Mr Clay and the Washington Union, for defeating the bill, and the Texas Senators are to be exonerated from censure? But this abominable amendment, had it been suffered to stand, would not, it seems, have secured the passage of the bill, without another sacrifice to slaveholding intolerance. The line of 350 30' was to be run through California, and the southern portion taken off for a new Territory, in which, says the Washington Union of Sunday morning, "the citizens of the South might have the opportunity of testing, at least, the effects of the climate and soil upon the slaves." The adoption of this amendment was also regarded as necessary

to the passage of the bill. But, let us hear from Mr. Foote, the most zeal ous, the most indefatigable, the most efficient advocate of the Compromise bill, an explicit statement of the calculations of the friends of the bill of the several amendments to be adopted to secure sufficient support in the South, and of the amount of concession the Northern supporters of the bill were prepared to yield. In his speech last Thursday, accompanying the introduction of his amendment to divide California, and erect its southern portion into a Territory, where Southern men might test, according to the Union, the value of slave labor, he said-

"It so happened, Mr. President, that I pre pared that amendment after a very extensive con sultation with the friends of this till, from th North and from the South. My own mind had become previously satisfied, almost entirely so, that it would be impossible to pass what we called the Adjustment bill, and what certain facetious gentlemen have thought proper to denominate the Omnibus bill, without some additional votes from the South; which votes I took it upon myself to endeavor to secure to the bill, by such an expla-nation as I was authorized by the existing friends "There were members of this body, sir, inclu

latitude, the objection to which was afterwards avoided by the proposition to appoint commissioners, whose duty it should be to agree upon that boundary line. Another amendment was one which I had the honor of laying upon the table a few days ago, and which is now printed, which proposed to preserve the Texas compact of which proposed to preserve the Texas compact of annexation intact. Sir, after conferring with the friends of the bill, from the North and the South, and from the East and the West—the avowed and ascer-

practicable to have obtained the boundary line for California of 350 36 p

So then, we are informed that the Northern supporters of the Compromise bill, smong whom were Mesers. Bright, Cass, Cooper, Dickinson, Whitcomb, and others of like faith, were prepared to sustain Dawson's amendment, virtually abandoning New Mexico to Texas, and to vote for the division of California, and the erection of te southern portion into a Territory, in which, as the Union says, "the citizens of the South might have the opportunity of testing, at least, the effects of the climate and soil upon slaves."

We hope the friends of Freedom will never et this fact escape remembrance.

#### THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE AND THE WASH-INCTON UNION

The New York Tribune, the great Whig champion of Freedom, and the Washington Union, the great Democratic champion of Slavery, were ooth employed as hands on the Clay Omnibus which was lately upset and broken to pieces. It is curious to note the mode in which each announces the overthrow. The Union, as usual sees but the reflection of its own lugubrious countenance in all the world about it. It is full f dismay and gloom, and therefore everybody else must be. "We have never," it says, "wit-2.27re profound sensation produced than

refer to the outburst of laughter with which the announcement was received in the House of Representatives?

The New York Tribune, not quite so melancholy, is considerably more venomous. It says:

"Well, gentlemen hostile to the Compro well, gentemen nostile to the Compromise:
the laboring oar is with you henceforth! We
Compromisers have tried and failed; it is your
turn now, and we heartily wish you a pleasant
job of it. Here are California to be admitted, New Mexico to be organized, (if you say admit-ted, too, so much the better,) and at all events to be defended against aggression from and subju-gation to Texas. We have made our rush, and ot a bill nearly through which provides a civi Government for Utah; now do you take hold and provide for the rest! If those whom we have supported through the late struggle should now behave factiously, ask us to help you score them! for henceforth you lead, and we follow. If Con-gress should adjourn without admitting Califoris, we shall blame you; for you have assured us that the Omnibus was the only impediment to her admission. So trot ahead your black and white team, and (the Omnibus being off the track) haul California into the Union, and give security, peace, order, and freedom, to New Mexico!"

So Mr. Greeley—for the writer signs his own

nitials to this irritable paragraph-admits that e was one of the managers of a Compromise which abandoned the Wilmot Provide, and, as we now know, could never have been got through, North, denounced it furiously. without Dawson's amendment, giving up New Mexico cast of the Rio Grande, and without another amendment cutting California in twain, and organizing the southern portion into a Territory for the accommodation of slaveholders. What a trustworthy, sagacious friend of Freedom is the Tribune-yoke-fellow in the same Omnibus with the Washington Union!

#### THE MEMBERS OF THE COMPROMISE COM-MITTER.

It is due to the members of the Compromis Committee of the Senate to say, that since the deest of the measure which they had prepared with so much labor and defended with so much ability, they show a liberal disposition to cooperate in other measures for the settlement of the California and Territorial Questions. That they are disappointed, grieved, mortified, we have no doubt; but we are glad to see them rising above all petty resentment, all selfish feeling, willing to consider respectfully what might be suggested

Mr. Clay, the day after the defeat of his longmission of California, as a separate measure since the Senate had decided against combining it with others; and in favor too of California unrestricted, with the boundaries she had desig nated. And he took occasion to administer scathing rebuke to the Disunionists and Nullifiers of the South, denouncing them as traitors, and pledging himself to stand by the Government of the Union in whatever efforts might be necessary to execute the laws of the United States. Much as he loved Kentucky, his own State, should her arm be raised against the Union, he would withstand her.

Mr. Foote was no less zealous in his denunciations of Disunion. We have seldom listened to s strain of invective and satire more powerful and effective than he delivered last Thursday against the nullifiers of South Carolina. He de eclared that he saw no cause for Disunion or Se cession, and held up such men as R. Barnwell Rhett and his associates to universal execration.

Mr. Atchison of Missouri, in some remarks last Friday, while censuring Northern men for their opposition to the Omnibus bill, took care to pour contempt upon the declaimers about Disunion. The dissolution of the Union was not a subject, he said, to be mentioned in the Senate of the United States; it should be left to stump orators and demagogues, who were in the habit of exploding any amount of gas.

Mr. Badger of North Carolina was no less severe upon the Rhetts and Tuckers. He denied the right of any Senator to speak for his State or for the South, and pledge it for Disunion. He gave it as his opinion, that there was no probable or possible contingency in which the State of North Carolina would give the slightest countenance, directly or indirectly, to any movement looking to the destruction of the Union. The Constitution of that State recognised the Federal Constitution as paramount, and in swearing fidelity to the former, the express qualification was made-so far as it does not conflict with the Constitution of the United States. For himself, he was a "citizen of the Union."

Now, although we have never apprehended anything very serious from the ridiculous movements of the Rhett tribe of politicians, we rejoice to see Southern Senators manfully rebuking the spirit of Disunion, and invoking the People of the South to maintain unimpaired their fidelity to the Union. If the traitorous demagogues were permitted to believe that they had the sympathies of their respectable fellow-citizens, they might be emboldened to commit some overt act which would bring on a temporary conflict with the Federal Government. As a friend of State rights, anxious that the Government of the Union should depend rather upon Public Opinion than Brute Force, we should deeply deplore such a

# AN INSULT. THOUGH NOT INTENDED.

Mr. Badger, last Friday, in the Senate, made certain declarations, extremely offensive to his Northern Whig brethren. They were in fact insulting, though he did not mean them to be so. He took the ground that the true policy of the South was to remain in the Union; for in that connection it had sufficient power to protect itself against all aggression. Though in a minority, it had in its hands a most effective means to bring the North to terms. Northern men needed protection for their manufactures. He was one who believed that Congress had power to impose prohibitory or protective duties to any amount, and he was in favor of the policy of protection. But, if Northern men would insist upon forcing their entimentalities, their notions about Slavery, on the South, he now would give them fair warning : their factories might decay ; their operatives might be turned out of employment ; their streets might be filled with able-bodied beggars, unable to obtain work; they must ask no favors from him-Never should his vote, or that of his colleague, and he believed he might say the same of his friends from Georgia, be given in support of any measure to protect or foster Northern industry

We cannot see the wisdom of such a me as this—especially as more than one-half of the Northern Senators ask no such protection, their

But by his Whig associates from the North t must have been regarded as insulting : for it assumed that their opposition to Slavery and its extension was either hypocritical, or, if the offspring of an enlightened moral sense, it might be overcome by an appeal to their avarioe.

Mr. Badger is a moderate man, and generally

courteous and good-tempered; but in this instance, he strangely forgot himself, and what was due to

We know not how far the capitalists of the North may be prepared to go for the sake of securing a Tariff that shall double their profits, but we know, that with the great majority of the people of the North, opposition to the extension of Sla. very springs from a moral principle, a religious sentiment, that can neither be bribed nor intimi-

# CONGRESS ON TUESDAY.

The bill for the admission of California was under consideration. Mr. Turney moved an amendment, restricting the southern boundary of California to 360 30', and providing for her admission into the Union when she should have accepted this amendment. The question was decided in the negative by a large majority, no Northern Senator voting for the proposition, and several Southern Senators against it. Mr. Ynlee of Plorida moved as a substitute,

I'm hards - wallander the Senate at length, which refused to adjourn, the majority showing a disposition to pass the bill for the admission of California, before adjourn-

The House was occupied in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, with the consideration of the Post Office Appropriation bill. but adjourned without disposing of it. The President sent in a message to both

Houses, respecting Texas and New Mexico. He takes the ground that New Mexico is United States territory-that by the treaty of Guadulupe Hidalgo the inhabitants are entitled to protection-that should any attempt be made to eject the United States from the Territory till the question of boundary be determined by the competent authority, the Federal Government will feel itself bound to employ all its military power to resist the attempt, and to enforce the treaty and laws of the United States. But he expresses a strong desire that Congress may speedily settle the question of boundary, giving countenance to the mode of settlement proposed in the Senste by the bill of Mr. Pearce.

The message was received in good temper by the Senate, but one or two members from the South in the House, natives, we believe, of the We shall publish it in our next.

### LITERARY NOTICES.

THE GALLERY OF ILLUSTRIOUS AMERICANS. From Da guerreotypes by Brady. C. Edwards Lester, Editor New York: Brady, D'Avignon, & Lester.

We have received but two numbers of this adnirable publication - the first and sixth. We owe the publishers an apology for thus far negecting to notice their valuable work.

The first contains a fine likeness of our late brave and noble President, General Taylor. This has now for us a new and mournful interest. The picture is marked by that republican simplicity, and the face expressive of that quiet strength, cool intrepidity, and sterling honesty, which were the distinguishing characteristics of the soldier and the civilian. The biography accompanying this portrait is quite brief, but written with much clearness and spirit No 6 contains the portrait and a sketch of the

life of one of the most remarkable men of this or

any other age, for genius and heroism - John

Charles Fremont. Here are a head and face for phrenologist and a physiognomist to life, deeds, and achievements of Colonel Fremont have been but the natural product, the inevitable result, of such an organization and such developments. The height and broad expanse of the orehead, the arch of the brow, the large orbit of the full clear eye, the firmness of the lips, the strength of the chin, the luxuriance of the hair and beard, the fulness of the chest, the energy and elasticity shown in the slight but well-knit figure-all are indications and proofs of his great natural capacities and powers, as they were once prophecies of his most eventful and brilliant career. Nature seems to have held back nothing which was needed to fit this heroic man for a destiny so peculiar and so important. In what character may we find so much imagination and executive energy working harmoniously togetherwhere find another mind so poetical, yet so eminently practical—a history so romantic, yet so useful—a spirit so daring and adventurous, yet so thoughtful and far-seeing, so boundless in resources, so patient in research! Taken all in all, the hero, the soldier, the man of science, and the "Pathfinder of Empire," seems a noble embodiment of the richest and strongest life of our time

of the same sort!" The biography of Colonel Fremont is written s all biographies should be written, in a tone of warm regard and enthusiastic admiration.

and our country. Heaven send us "a few more

For sale by Taylor & Maury, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

GRAHAM'S MAGAZINE. August, 1850. This is a very interesting number of a popular periodical. The contributions seem to be all good, but we have marked a Californian Ballad, by Bayard Taylor, a sketch by Caroline Chesebro, and the critical notices by Mr. Whipple, as especially commendable. This magazine has been steadily improving under the lately returned care of its present enterprising proprietor. We must not forget to speak of the beautiful premium plate which Mr. Graham is sending to all single

subscribers who pay in advance. This is "CHRIST

BLESSING LITTLE CHILDREN"—a truly admirable SARTAIN'S UNION MAGAZINE. August, 1850. This is a good number of a periodical of s more solid and serious character than most of its class. It has a choice list of English and American contributors. In the number before us we particularly like the article on "DRESS," by Mrs. Kirkland; "Rosamond," by Mary Howitt; and

THE CHRISTIAN FXAMINER. Boston : Crosby & Nichol This is the Unitarian Quarterly-s most admirable and high-toned publication. To give our readers an idea of its merits, we need only subjoin a list of the contributors to the presen

Rev. Nathaniel L. Frothingham, Mr. Georg B. Emerson, Rev. Ephraim Peabody, D. D., Mr. Edward Wigglesworth, Mr. C. C. Smith, Rev. Charles T. Brooks, Rev. Artemas B. Muzzey, Professor Louis Agassiz

THE AMERICAN ATHENEUM. A monthly magazine Science, Morals, and Literature. Boston: A. R. Brown This is the first number of a work, of which after reading the preface, and glancing over the contents, we would heartily say our word of praise and encouragement; and we can hardly do it better service than to quote with our entire

"We also design to make the Athenaum express the spirit of the times, and echo the lofty ideas of human progress, which are now finding utterance in various parts of the world. Our columns will be open to discoveries in Science; to improvements in Art; to a calm, dispassionate discussion of great moral questions; to the utterance of great religious truths, and the dissemination of just and patriotic sentiments. We shall shun no subject which shall have to do with human progress, and with human good; but, as far as our limits will allow, shall freely canvass the great, engrossing topics of thought and action."

HOLDER'S DOLLAR MAGAZINS. August, 1860 Here is a magazine which we would heartil commend to our readers—it deserves well generous patronage of the public. It has a good